

Intermarriage and Ethnicity: Punjabi Mexican Americans, Mexican Japanese, and Filipino Americans

Karen B. Leonard
University of California, Irvine

The problem is intermarriage, specifically intermarriages patterned by gender (all the men are from one ethnic background and almost all of the women from another) which produce significant biethnic communities. The author's original research on Punjabi Mexican Americans, people whose fathers came from India's Punjab province and whose mothers were of predominantly Mexican or Mexican American heritage, combined field work and interviews with California county records and local historical materials to show the flexibility of ethnic identity. She compares the Punjabi Mexican Americans to Filipino European Americans and Mexican Japanese, using studies done by Barbara Posadas and Chizuko Watanabe. She finds that in all three cases members of the second biethnic generation evidence considerable flexibility with respect to their ethnic identity; they also insist upon cultural pluralism and claim the dominant national identity, particularly when confronted by new immigrants from the fathers' countries.

The ethnic identity of immigrants is strongly shaped by the historical context and other actors in it. In California in the early twentieth century, some 400 immigrant men from India's Punjab province married Mexican and Mexican-American women. These couples and their children formed a biethnic community in rural California. Called by others "Mexican-Hindus," "Mexidus," "Punjabi Mexicans," or "half-and-halves," they generally called themselves "Hindus." Elsewhere, I have shown how the Punjabi Mexican families contested and negotiated ethnic identity within marriages, within families, and in arenas beyond the family over the decades. In

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

particular, a new wave of immigrants from South Asia after 1965 helped push the second generation toward an “American” identity which is consciously pluralistic.¹

Two other communities comparable to the Punjabi Mexican Americans—the Mexican Japanese studied by Chizuko Watanabe and the Filipino Americans studied by Barbara Posadas²—also feature intermarriages between Asian immigrant men and non-Asian women and a sharp difference between descendants of earlier immigrants and later immigrants from the same place of origin. All three cases raise important questions about intermarriage and ethnic identity and about the nature of ethnic or cultural pluralism. All three cases show the historical contingency of ethnicity as people define themselves vis a vis others in their environments over time.

Intermarriage and Ethnicity

The general public and scholars have viewed intermarriage as a measure of social change. In the past, marriage outside of “one’s own group” was often feared. Scholarly interest in intermarriage arose in the context of fears about new immigrants and debates about U.S. immigration policy. The arrival of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and South Asian immigrants in the Pacific Coast states spurred successive anti-Asian federal immigration legislation and agreements (the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, the 1907-08 Gentlemen’s Agreement with Japan, the 1917 “Barred Zone” Act). Western states also enacted laws to block Asian access to agricultural land (starting with California’s 1913 Alien Land Law) and to prevent racial intermarriages.³ In the eastern United States, people were concerned that immigrants from southern and eastern Europe might dilute by intermarriage the “American” intellectual and cultural standards set by earlier immigrants from northern and western Europe. When Edmund deS Brunner studied immigrant farmers and their children in New York, Wisconsin, and Nebraska in the 1920s, he was interested in the newer immigrants’ impact upon the older farming population through intermarriage. He used marriage license applications to measure the marriage choices of the foreign-born and their children, tabulating “in-choice” and “out-choice” for Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians, Teutonics, Slavics, and Latins.⁴

Intermarriage studies done in California in the 1930s tried to ascertain the conditions which produced marriages across racial and ethnic boundaries. The state’s anti-miscegenation laws prohibited marriages between whites and blacks and between whites and Mongolians, but until 1933 marriages between whites and Filipinos were allowed. With the 1933 prohibition on white/Filipino marriages, Constantine Panunzio undertook a study of intermarriage in Los

Angeles from 1924 to 1933. He classified the population into three categories: whites, Negroes, and "yellow-browns," the last category including Mexicans, Japanese, Filipinos, Chinese, and American Indians. He found 4,652 interracial marriages (2.7% of the 170,636 marriages) in Los Angeles County during that period, a relatively high rate, and he postulated that sex ratios for these groups would be the main determinant of marriage choices. Panunzio also resorted to "common sense" remarks about culture to explain many of the patterns in the data.⁵ Filipino and Mexican intermarriage ratios were the highest, 229 and 116 per 100 respectively. Panunzio stated that because Mexicans were classed as whites in the United States censuses of 1910 and 1920, they "could pass as whites." He berated those "Mexicans" who, "legally permitted to do so, evidently described themselves as whites in applying for licenses, whereas in reality they were persons born in the United States of Mexican parentage," a propensity necessitating closer examination of his data and a statistical "correction."⁶

Just as Panunzio assumed that laws did prevent intermarriage (he ended his study in 1933, since the most active participants, Filipinos, were prohibited from marrying whites in that year), later scholars assumed that intermarriages would follow the repeal of California's anti-miscegenation laws in 1948.⁷ While legal constraints did have an impact on marriages, people could work around them,⁸ and the folk categories did not always coincide with the legal ones. The folk categories Panunzio used in his 1942 study were quite revealing about the groups within which marriages were popularly sanctioned. His "yellow-brown" category lumped together some who could and some who could not legally marry whites; the category included "Mexicans" who legally were whites! In practice, it was the rare and exceptionally nasty county clerk who tried to prohibit marriages between members of groups within the "yellow-brown" category (or between "yellow-browns" and blacks).

In contrast to much earlier work on racial and ethnic intermarriage which tended to regard it as deviant behavior, most recent work views intermarriage as a form of structural assimilation that follows or coincides with cultural assimilation or acculturation.⁹ Research done in the 1950s on intermarriage rates for Mexican-Americans found that they were about three times more likely to intermarry than Anglos and that Mexican-American women were more likely to intermarry than Mexican-American men.¹⁰ In 1982, Arce and Abney-Guardado summarized a whole range of recent studies of Chicano intermarriages. The consensus was that women are consistently more exogamous ("outmarrying") than men; that the higher one's social status the greater the rate of exogamy; that there is more exogamy among persons of native stock and least among the foreign-

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

born; and that lower rates of exogamy are found in rural areas than in urban areas.¹¹ Most of these results come from the analysis of macro-level aggregate data—marriage licenses, the census, or social survey questionnaires—and the results are not similar to those obtained in my detailed sociohistorical study of the Punjabi Mexicans. In fact, Arce and Abney-Guardado remark that sociopsychological investigation of Chicano intermarriage is virtually nonexistent.¹² Certainly most of the studies they cite shed little or no light on matters like language, religion, and ethnic identity within the marriages.

The Punjabi Mexican Americans

The Punjabis who came to the Pacific Coast from the turn of the century were almost all men and most of them were Sikhs, members of the religious group founded in northwestern India in the late fifteenth century. Called “Hindus” by others because they came from “Hindustan,” the men were largely illiterate peasants from farming backgrounds. Many had served in British military or police service, in India and in China’s treaty ports; in California, they became farm laborers and farmers.

The first Punjabi Mexican marriages took place in California’s southernmost agricultural valley in 1916 and 1917. Prevented by tightening federal immigration laws and policies¹³ from bringing wives and children to the United States, four or five hundred of the Punjabi immigrants married local women, primarily Mexican and Mexican-American Spanish-speaking Catholics. Just as the Imperial Irrigation District was being set up in the Imperial Valley along the Mexican border and Punjabi farmers, among others, were developing cotton there, the Mexican Revolution sent refugee families across the border looking for work. Punjabi men in their thirties and forties married women who were usually much younger, often sets of sisters or a mother and daughter, who were working as cotton pickers in their fields. Typically these couples settled in the Imperial Valley, although some settled in Arizona, Texas, and central and northern California.

These Punjabi immigrants broke the rules of caste and religious endogamy so characteristic of Indian society. They did so to a surprising degree—recent studies of Punjabis and Indians overseas have found strong endogamous patterns and little evidence of outmarriage.¹⁴ However, the indications are that early Punjabi immigrants, particularly Sikh men, were open to intermarriage. Barrier found that Sikh soldiers in Burma in the 1980s wrote back to Sikh journals in the Punjab to ask if Sikhs should intermarry with Burmese

girls,¹⁵ a query presumably reflecting the occurrence of such marriages. About the early Sikh immigrants to Canada, Buchignani and Indra remark that "there are some weak indications (of) long term liaisons with native Indian women living on reserves around Vancouver, but this has not been researched."¹⁶ Because Canada removed the ban on the immigration of Asian Indian wives and children in 1919, Canada's Asian Indian population was able to follow marriage practices like those in India,¹⁷ in great contrast to the population in California which developed Punjabi Mexican biethnic communities.

The Punjabi Mexican marriages were not always successful (in the Imperial Valley there were many divorces), but a large second generation was raised with the biethnic community as its major reference point. The children had names like Manuela Singh, Armando Mohammed, and Jose Chand. They spoke Spanish and English and almost all were Catholic; very few learned the Punjabi language or know much about Sikhism, Islam, or Hinduism (the religions of their fathers.) The fathers and mothers participated in the *compadrazgo* system of godparenthood sponsored by the Catholic church, with Sikh and Muslim fathers standing as godparents to each others' children in some cases. Since almost all godparents were drawn from within the biethnic community, the *compadrazgo* system did not incorporate the Punjabi Mexican families into the growing Mexican-American communities in California. Contrary to a prediction that the Punjabi men would be assimilated into American society through the Mexican-American "subculture,"¹⁸ there was prejudice against the couples and their "half-and-half" children from Mexican-Americans. With the 1923 U.S. Supreme Court decision that Asian Indians could not become U.S. citizens, California's Alien Land Laws were applied to the Punjabi farmers, and they, like the Japanese farmers against whom the bill had been designed, could not lease or own agricultural land. But their children were citizens and the Punjabi men could put property in the names of their minor children and manage it through county probate courts.¹⁹

As the children matured, tensions within the Punjabi Mexican families increased. Many of the fathers tried to control their children's dating and marriage choices, while the mothers, closer in age and domestic culture to their children, sided with them. Family problems were exacerbated by national and international developments. In 1946, the Luce-Celler bill extended to Asian Indians the right to become naturalized United States citizens, so that the men could own land in their own names (often reclaiming it from their children). In 1947, India and Pakistan became independent, so the men could travel to their former homelands and reestablish meaningful contact

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

with their Punjabi relatives (many had left wives and children there), perhaps sponsoring their immigration. Where family difficulties had arisen, the Punjabi Mexican family could be displaced by Punjabi relatives.²⁰

An even greater impact on the California biethnic families followed from the 1965 Immigration Act and the large numbers of South Asian immigrants who came to the U.S. as a result. While the majority of these new immigrants were urban professionals, several thousand Punjabi farming families joined the dwindling group of oldtimers in northern California (Yuba City and Marysville in particular), numerically overwhelming the small number of Punjabi Mexican families there.²¹ The new South Asian immigrants are almost entirely ignorant of the history of the early immigrants and the constraints which determined many of their choices. When they encounter each other, the new immigrants do not recognize the Punjabi Mexicans as "Hindus." The second and third generations continue to cook chicken curry and roti (North Indian bread) and proudly claim to be not only Hindu, but also Mexican, and, most of all, American.²²

Part of "being Hindu" to the biethnic families lay in representing India to others. They did this successfully in rural California for decades, despite changes in language, religion, and marriage practices. While there was a pride in Punjabi ancestry, and some of the Hispanic wives were said to have "become Hindu,"²³ there was a greater insistence on being "American." Very few members of the second generation married each other; most married Mexican-Americans or Euro-Americans.²⁴ Punjabi Mexicans point to the ways in which the new immigrants do not "become American," in contrast to the biethnic couples, and arguments for ethnic pluralism are implicit in their discourse about ethnic identity.²⁵

Comparable Cases

There seem to be very few systematically biethnic communities, where all the men are from one background and all the women from another, and even fewer studies of them.²⁶ There are Mexican Japanese, a few in the Imperial Valley and a large community in Mexico; there are Mexican Chinese, a few in the Imperial Valley and more on the Mexican side of the border. Unfortunately we know little about these groups, particularly about their family life.²⁷ There were Chinese Mexican marriages in Arizona and details about one or two families are suggestive, but no systematic research has been done.²⁸ Studies of the Chinese in Mexico note that Mexican Chinese marriages were controversial there (they were banned at times) and that

Mexican Chinese children were culturally close to their mothers.²⁹ The Chinese in Mississippi, some of whom married black women, have been studied, but marital life is not examined; race relations is the topic of interest.³⁰

Ethnicity at the level of interracial or interethnic family life has received little attention. Velina Hasu Houston's play "Tea" explores the world of Japanese war brides set down in Kansas, the tensions produced by race and class differences within and between the couples.³¹ There are a few studies based on intensive interviewing, such as Susan Benson's work on interracial families in London, but the couples she studied are not part of any one community.³² However, Chizuko Watanabe's study of the Japanese in Mexico and Barbara Posadas' studies of the Filipino-Europeans in Chicago do focus on groups comparable to the Punjabi Mexicans.

The Mexican Japanese studied by Chizuko Watanabe shared certain characteristics with the Punjabi Mexicans. Japanese immigration to Mexico was greatest between 1908 (when the Gentlemen's Agreement cut it off to the United States) and 1932 (when the Mexican government prohibited such immigration). While the Japanese men settling in Mexico were able to bring wives from Japan and many did so (Watanabe's primary interest was in those couples and their descendants), there were many Mexican Japanese couples. According to Watanabe, pure-blooded descendants said that Mexican Japanese marriages did not work and there were divorces among such couples. She wrote about the Japanese prejudice against exogamous marriages, particularly in Baja California,³³ but two of her sources (Fujioka, 1924, and Taki, 1968, citing a 1935 marital survey) reported that a majority of the married Japanese men in Mexico were married to Mexican women. There were at least 354 such couples, and an estimated two of every three children born to Japanese immigrants were of mixed parentage. A special term, *Konketsu* or mixed blood, contrasted those children with *Junketsu*, or pure blood, Japanese children.³⁴

The experience of the Mexican Japanese children paralleled that of the Punjabi Mexicans in many ways. The *Nikkei* (Japanese or half-Japanese born in Mexico), even those children whose parents were both Japanese, all spoke Spanish as "their first language, without exception." The *Nikkei* in Mexico were all Roman Catholics and many *Issei* (first generation immigrants) too had been baptized with Christian names; there was syncretism of Catholicism and Buddhism. The *Nikkei* also adopted the *compadrazgo* system, which worked "not to assimilate them into the greater Mexican society" but "to strengthen the bond of the *Nikkei* community."³⁵

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

The forced relocation of Japanese to Mexico City and Guadalajara by the Mexican government during World War II greatly altered the distribution of the Mexican Japanese within Mexico and led to urban/rural divergences in ethnic choices. After the war, those with "Mexican families" and "good relationships with local people" went back to their old homes, and they were "absorbed." Those who stayed in the two cities, particularly Mexico City, strengthened their ethnic network and identity as Nikkei, vowing to assimilate but "never be absorbed."³⁶ Watanabe noted that these Mexico City Nikkei made a clear distinction between "we" Japanese and "they" Mexicans (while Mexico was said to be more welcoming to the Japanese than the United States and they could become Mexican citizens, they could not hold political office).³⁷ But the Nikkei also felt a strong barrier between themselves and a growing group of newcomers from Japan (diplomats and business people, short-term residents of Mexico). Japanese from Japan did not recognize the Nikkei as fully Japanese. In Japan, "The average Japanese is not even aware that there is a Nikkei community in Mexico....the Japanese who are sent to Mexico are totally unprepared to meet them. The only background information which is related to them is that they are children of poor immigrants."³⁸ Although the Nikkei in Mexico exhibited two ethnic patterns depending upon their choice of residence after World War II, their experiences have much in common with those of the Punjabi Mexicans in California.

Barbara Posada's work on early Filipino-fathered families in Chicago, particularly her interviews with ten daughters, or mestizas, offers more similarities and contrasts to the Punjabi Mexican case.³⁹ The Filipino immigrant fathers came to Chicago in 1920s and 1930s. They were educated men, high school graduates who often had some college experience, and they worked in urban jobs (many were Pullman railroad car attendants and travelled a lot). The women they married were primarily eastern or southern European white women, typically women younger than themselves, and there were about 500 such interracial couples in the city. Despite some residential clustering and shared adherence to Catholicism this was too small a number to establish a "viable community," according to Posada. (And not only did the men in Chicago come from many parts of the Philippines, the women were of diverse ethnic backgrounds.)

Within these families, some of the same tensions appeared as in the Punjabi Mexican ones, but there were also differences. Food in the home reflected the biethnic marriages; "rice and potatoes competed at daily dinners."⁴⁰ There were problems with the women's families and problems finding housing. Although discrimination and prejudice against these couples often strengthened the marital bonds, there were divorces. Unlike the generally large Punjabi

Mexican and Mexican Japanese families, the Filipino American families were small: the thirteen couples interviewed by Posadas had 1.38 children per couple.⁴¹ As post-1965 Filipino immigrants began to dominate the annual Joze Rizal commemoration dance, oldtimers took renewed pride in their survival and in their heritage, but they also found that compared to the newcomers they had become very "American."⁴²

This new identity was nowhere more evident than in the raising of their children, where "spouses generally abandoned explicit cultural identification..., preferring instead to define a new 'American' emphasis."⁴³ The children spoke English rather than either parent's mother tongue (the Punjabi Mexicans were bilingual, in English and Spanish, and the Mexican Japanese spoke Spanish). The mestiza daughters felt closer to their fathers, whom they resembled more in appearance and whose presence at home meant pleasure, not discipline. The fathers made decisions about their children's schooling and encouraged their daughters to get as much education as possible. Yet as they began dating, daughters turned to their mothers, since conflicts with the fathers became sharper then. Of the ten daughters in Posadas' study, none remarked on pressure with respect to the ethnicity of their beaus and/or spouses; none married a Filipino, a part-Filipino, or a spouse of the mother's background. She argues that both fathers and mothers encouraged the daughters to assimilate to the dominant society, to reject their ethnicity and race. Mestiza identity rested on being American; to be proud of one's father was not synonymous with knowledge of or pride in Filipino heritage. Relationships with the new Filipino immigrants were tenuous. Posadas reports no sense of closeness to the post-1965 Filipino newcomers and their culture or organizations. She views her informants as the products of American mass culture, not of an ethnic enclave.⁴⁴

All three examples, the Punjabi Mexican Americans, the Mexican Japanese, and the Filipino Americans, suggest complex relationships between intermarriage, ethnic identity, and sociocultural change. The formation of ethnic identity for members of these three biethnic communities was not an easy matter, determined by one parent or one parent's culture being "stronger" than the other. Nor were professions of ethnic identity necessarily rooted in attributes traditionally associated with the ethnicity professed—the second generation "Hindus" in the Imperial Valley and the Nikkei in Mexico City differ in language and religion from what one might expect from their names. The families and individuals in these biethnic communities exercised considerable flexibility as they chose ethnic identities.

In all three cases, intermarriage was not the only significant factor

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

influencing ethnic identity. Notions of culture have been biased "toward rooting not travel," and in these cases the men and sometimes the women were immigrants.⁴⁵ The point in time at which these Asian immigrants arrived in the Americas was clearly important; federal and state laws concerning immigration, citizenship, and intermarriage determined basic parameters of family life for all three groups. Just as clearly, confrontation with more recent immigrants from India, Japan, or the Philippines helped sharpen awareness of American or Mexican identity as an additional and powerful ethnic identity for members of the biethnic families.

The distance between old and new immigrants from the same homeland cannot simply be explained by the passage of one or two generations or by a hypothesized difference in their regional or socioeconomic origins. True, later immigrants were well educated for their time. In the case of the Punjabis, recent Punjabi immigrants closely comparable to the earlier ones have come to northern California, but again a distance separates them from the descendants of the pioneers. Strong prejudices against intermarriage undoubtedly contribute to the distance felt by more recent immigrants. These prejudices are countered by the descendants' claims to be "American" in the two United States cases. (The Mexican Japanese who were "absorbed" and claim to be Mexican are not represented in Watanabe's work, save in one life history in an appendix.)⁴⁶ What do such claims mean with respect to debates about cultural and ethnic pluralism in the U.S.?

Not only the transformations in the domain of ethnic identity, but their rapidity and the insistence on notions of cultural pluralism stand out in the cases above. Current anthropological debate about culture and sociocultural change is striking down the notions of bounded cultural units located in time and space, units sometimes ranked with respect to one another. Those notions are giving way to a recognition of the difficulties of finding such units, particularly in the contemporary world, and anthropologists are emphasizing transition and transformation, historical processes affecting "connected social fields" rather than "cultures."⁴⁷

We are hearing much today about transnational culture, international networks linking immigrants to each other and to their homelands, and about the cultural transformations and continuities encouraged by such networks. However, the three biethnic communities above were established two or three generations ago, and historical changes in ethnic identity have been well documented. It is likely that the Punjabi Mexican Americans and the Filipino Americans are among those "distorting" their ethnicity by selecting among their ancestries or claiming to be "American" in the 1980 Census. The sociologists Mary Waters and Stanley Lieberson are concerned about

"increasing distortion in the true origins of the population" in the Census. They have used the term "hyphenated whites" for those of mixed ethnic ancestry who do not identify with or know about their specific European origins.⁴⁸

Waters went on to examine people's conceptions of ethnic identity more closely in a separate project based on white upper middle class Catholics. She talks about the ease with which these "unhyphenated-whites" or "Americans" (she and Lieberman regrettably seem to equate these terms) leap from specific "true" indications of ethnicity to a "symbolic ethnicity," an ethnic identity which is voluntary and imposes no constraints upon daily life. She hypothesizes that the ease with which her informants claim these symbolic ethnicities leads to a prejudice against non-whites, a failure to understand that they cannot escape ascriptive characteristics and leap to unhyphenated or American status.⁴⁹

Waters' hypothesis raises important issues about ethnic pluralism and the extent to which a plural society might perpetuate class and/or racial and ethnic divisions. As John Higham has pointed out, recent scholarly work on ethnic pluralism in the United States emphasizes power rather than culture, charging that systematic economic inequalities threaten the compatibility of ethnic pluralism and democracy; the persistence of ethnic identity would mean the persistence of class cleavages.⁵⁰ Waters had no non-white informants and seems to preclude their choice of an "unhyphenated" or "American" identity. Her analysis of symbolic ethnicity tempted her to suggest that the situational choice of ethnic identity by whites, including "American" or "unhyphenated" identity, helps to maintain ethnic or racial constraints for non-whites. However, while the Punjabi Mexican and Filipino Americans were often categorized and treated as non-whites, they often chose unhyphenated and/or American identities.⁵¹

Others writing about ethnic pluralism have continued to view minority groups and biethnic communities as marginal, subcultural, or, the most recent terms, "borderland" or "peripheral." Imposition of such labels is particularly tempting in the case of the Punjabi Mexicans, the Filipino American daughters, and the Mexican Japanese because of the mediating role played by the Hispanic and European-American women. The literature building on the work of Gloria Anzaldua speaks of women as inhabitants of borderlands, marginalized beings who move in the interstices between groups and who sustain contradictions, invent themselves, and help transform their sense of individual oppression into collective resistance.⁵² Yet the voices of the Punjabi Mexican Americans and the mestiza daughters speak to the centrality of the American component in their experience. Their pride in their Asian ancestries does not connect

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

them to new immigrants from India or the Philippines, and they see no contradiction between that pride and their claim to be American.

This comparison of three biethnic communities constituted by Asian/non-Asian intermarriages looked at transformations of ethnic identity across space and time and tried to hear what people said about their own ethnicity. The voices often gave surprising testimony, testimony that strengthens John Higham's call for the revitalization of "a common faith" for a decent multiethnic society.⁵³ Working together, historians, anthropologists, and sociologists can contribute to a clearer understanding of the ways in which immigrants and their descendants identify themselves in complex societies.

NOTES

¹Karen Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992).

²Chizuko Watanabe, "The Japanese Immigrant Community in Mexico: Its History and Present" (M.A. thesis, California State University, Los Angeles, 1983); Barbara M. Posadas, "Mestiza Girlhood: Interracial Families in Chicago's Filipino American Community Since 1925," in ed. Asian Women United of California, *Making Waves* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

³See Sucheng Chan, *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990), for details.

⁴Edmund deS Brunner, *Immigrant Farmers and their Children* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1929).

⁵Constantine Panunzio, "Intermarriage in Los Angeles, 1924-33," *American Journal of Sociology* 47:5 (1942), 697-700. Panunzio's interest was in the marriages of other groups with whites, and the rankings within the white category which concerned Brunner and others are only hinted at in Panunzio's study.

⁶Panunzio, "Intermarriage," 692-693.

⁷John H. Burma, "Research Note on the Measurement of Interracial Marriage," *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (1952), 587-589; John H. Burma, "Interethnic Marriage in Los Angeles, 1948-1959," *Social Forces* (1963), 156-165.

⁸One could be married at sea or in some other state; one could also

find an ignorant or sympathetic county clerk and secure a license.

⁹M.M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); Richard M. Bernard, *The Melting Pot and the Altar: Marital Assimilation in Early Twentieth Century Wisconsin* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), xxvii and xxi. Larry Hajime Shinagawa and Gin Yong Pang suggest, alternatively, that intermarriage is a function of inequality and is best explained by hypergamy theory: "Marriage Patterns of Asian Americans in California, 1980," in *Income and Status Differences Between White and Minority Americans*, ed. Sucheng Chen (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990) 225-282.

¹⁰Burma, 1963, 161; John H. Burma, *Spanish-speaking Groups in the United States* (Durham, N.D.: Duke University Press, 1954), 87.

¹¹Carlos H. Arce and Armando Abney-Guardado, "Demographic and Cultural Correlates of Chicano Intermarriage," *California Sociologist* 5:2 (1982), 41-57.

¹²Arce and Abney-Guardado, 42-43.

¹³Harold S. Jacoby, "Administrative Restriction of Asian Indian Immigration into the United States, 1907-1917," *Population Review* 25 (1982), 35-40.

¹⁴Vaughan Robinson, "Patterns of South Asian Ethnic Exogamy and Endogamy in Britain," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 3:4 (1980), 427-443; Parminder Bhachu, *Twice Migrants* (New York: Tavistock, 1985), 74-75. Rashmi Desai, *Indian Immigrants in Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), mentions early "deviants" among the Asian Indian immigrants to Britain who lived with non-Indian women or made mixed marriages: 4, 122-144.

¹⁵N. Gerald Barrier, "Sikh Immigrants and Their Homeland: the Transmission of Information, Resources, and Values in the Early Twentieth Century," in N. Gerald Barrier and Verne A. Dusenbery, eds., *The Sikh Diaspora: Migration and the Experience Beyond Punjab* (New Delhi: Manohar and South Asian Books, 1989), 63.

¹⁶Norman Buchignani and Doreen Marie Indra, "Key Issues in Canadian-Sikh Ethnic and Race Relations," in N. Gerald Barrier and Verne A. Dusenbery, eds., 1989, 176.

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

tion of South Asians in Canada, 1904-1920," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, eds., *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada*, (New York: Methuen, 1981), 215-218.

¹⁸Yusuf Dadabhai, "Circuitous Assimilation among Rural Hindustanis in California," *Social Forces* 33 (1954), 138-141.

¹⁹Imperial County Probate Records, County Clerk's office, El Centro.

²⁰See Leonard, Chapter Ten.

²¹The Punjabis in northern California had tended to remain bachelors in the U.S.: see Bruce La Brack, *The Sikhs of Northern California 1904-1975; A Socio-historical Study* (New York: AMS Press, 1988).

²²For more on "being Hindu," see Karen Leonard, "Ethnicity Con-founded: Punjabi Pioneers in California," in eds. J.O'Connell, M. Israel, Willard G. Oxtoby, with W.H. McLeod and J.S. Grewal, visiting eds., *Sikh History and Religion in the 20th Century* (Toronto: South Asian Studies Papers, 3, Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto, 1988), 314-333, and "Pioneer Voices from California: Reflections on Race, Religion, and Ethnicity," in eds. N. Gerald Barrier and Verne A. Dusenbery, 1989, 120-139. "Being Hindu" rested on the preparation of Punjabi foods and on identification with the Punjabis men's pride as landowners and political activists against British rule in India and for citizenship in the United States.

²³Similarly, Judith Nagata has reported that Malay and Indian woman marrying Arabs in Malaysia "become Arab": "What is Malay? Institutional Selection of Ethnic Identity in a Plural Society," *American Ethnologist* 1 (1974), 345.

²⁴Leonard, 158, for the 2nd generation spouses.

²⁵See Leonard, Chapter Eleven.

²⁶Descendants of Dutch and Portuguese men and Sri Lankan women exemplify "political ethnicity" in the context of European colonial rule and post-colonial Sri Lankan society: Dennis B. McGilvray, "Dutch Burghers and Portuguese Mechanics: Eurasian Ethnicity in Sri Lanka," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24:2 (1982), 262-263.

²⁷Yuji Ichioka does not mention biethnic families: *The Issei, the World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants 1885-1924* (New York: The

Leonard—Intermarriage and Ethnicity

of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants 1885-1924 (New York: The Free Press, 1988).

²⁸Lawrence Michael Fong, "Sojourners and Settlers: The Chinese Experience in Arizona," *The Journal of Arizona History* 21:3 (1980), 227-256, particularly 243, 245, and 251. Ruthanne Lum McCunn's recent *Chinese American Portraits* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1988), 82, has a photograph of a Chinese Mexican family in Arizona; see also the photo in Heather S. Hatch, "The Chinese in the Southwest: A Photographic Record," *The Journal of Arizona History* 21:3 (1980), 274.

²⁹Evelyn Hu-DeHart, "Immigrants to a Developing Society: The Chinese in Northern Mexico, 1875-1932," *The Journal of Arizona History* 21:3 (1980), 275-312, for general coverage and other sources; Evelyn Hu-DeHart, "Racism and Anti-Chinese Persecution in Sonora, Mexico, 1876-1932," *Amerasia Journal* 9:2 (1982), 24-25, states that the children of intermarriages were culturally like their mothers and "totally integrated."

³⁰James W. Loewen, *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971) offers few details of family life for the early Chinese-black families; Robert S. Quan, *Lotus Among the Magnolias* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1982), scarcely mentions such families.

³¹Velina Hasu Houston, "Tea," *Plays in Process* 9:5 (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1989), first performed in 1985.

³²Susan Benson, *Ambiguous Ethnicity: Interracial Families in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

³³Chizuko Watanabe, personal communication, Los Angeles, 1981; Watanabe, 1983, 125-126.

³⁴Watanabe, 52-53. But in Mexicali, across the border from Calexico in the Imperial Valley, the few Japanese men had little contact with Mexicans: 56.

³⁵Watanabe, 53, 171-172, 134.

³⁶Watanabe, 190, and for the motto "We should assimilate but let us never be absorbed," 94.

³⁷Watanabe, 139, for the "we"/"they" dichotomy; while those born

Explorations in Ethnic Studies

³⁸Watanabe, 146.

³⁹For the following, Posadas, 273-282, and Barbara M. Posadas, "Crossed Boundaries in Interracial Chicago: Filipino American Families since 1925," *Amerasia Journal* 8:2 (1981), 31-52.

⁴⁰Posadas, 1981, 46.

⁴¹Posadas, 1981, 47. The 66 wives of Punjabis for whom I was able to compile fertility histories had 6.4 children each. Watanabe's individual cases all have two or more children.

⁴²Posadas, 1981, 48.

⁴³Posadas, 1981, 46, and Posadas, 1989.

⁴⁴In Posadas, one person argues that the mixed children are more at home with Filipinos than Americans, while another stresses the distance between the descendants of the early immigrants and the post-1965 immigrants: 1989, 276.

⁴⁵James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 338. Over half of the Hispanic wives were immigrants from Mexico, while the European-American daughters who married Filipinos were more often the daughters of immigrants.

⁴⁶Watanabe, 1983, 195-208.

⁴⁷Sally Falk Moore, *Social Facts and Fabrications* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 4-5; see also Eric R. Wolf, "Inventing Society," *American Ethnologist* 15:4 (1988), 752-761, and James Ferguson and Akhil Gupta, "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference," *Cultural Anthropologist*, Feb. 1992, 6-23.

⁴⁸Stanley Lieberson and Mary C. Waters, *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), 249-250, 264-268; Stanley Lieberson and Mary C. Waters, "'The Rise of a New Ethnic Group: The 'Unhyphenated American,'" *Items* 43:1 (1989), 7-10.

⁴⁹Mary C. Waters, *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990),

⁵⁰John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*

⁵⁰John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984, 2nd ed.), 198-230; Howard N. Rabinowitz, "Race, Ethnicity, Cultural Pluralism in American History," in eds. James M. Gardner and George Rollie Adams, *Ordinary People and Everyday Life: Perspectives on the New Social History* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1983), 28; Stephen Steinberg, *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America* (New York: Atheneum, 1981), the epilogue.

⁵¹Watanabe's life history (note 6) and anecdotes suggest that (46) the Mexican Japanese view themselves as Mexican.

⁵²Gloria Anzaldua, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987), especially 78-80.

⁵³Higham, 232.